26

THE MENACE TO THE IDEAL OF THE FREE STATE

JOHN A. W. HAAS

THE MENACE TO THE IDEAL OF THE FREE STATE

AN ADDRESS DELIVERED ON THE OCCASION OF FOUNDERS' DAY AT URSINUS COLLEGE

BY JOHN A. W. HAAS, D.D., L.L.D.,
PRESIDENT OF MUHLENBERG COLLEGE, ALLENTOWN, PENNA.

ALLENTOWN, PENNSYLVANIA
NINETEEN EIGHTEEN

LITTLE BOOKS INTIMATELY RE
LATED TO MUHLENBERG COL
LEGE, PRINTED & ARRANGED
INTO A BOOK IN THE COLLEGE
PRINTSHOP ON THE CAMPUS
MCMXVIII

THE MENACE TO THE IDEAL OF THE FREE STATE

IF EVER there was a time when it behooved us to utter with a new, larger significance, Longfellow's prayer for the ship of state, it is today. We can and we ought to say:

> "Sail on, O Ship of State;
> Sail on, O Union, strong and great!
> Humanity with all its fears,
> With all its hopes of future years,
> Is hanging breathless on thy fate."

Today the hopes of men are not fastened upon the continuance of our own internal union or upon the permanence of our republic, but upon the larger problem of the continuance of freedom and democracy in the world. On our fate and the fate of those with us men are hanging breath-

less. But our fate must be made expressive of our faith. We are standing before all humanity as the guarantors of a certain ideal of the state. The hopes of all the centuries hang at this time on the realization among men of the ideal for which we have long contended, and which thru no desire of our own we must now defend in the interests of the world and of all humanity as over against another ideal. The political significance of the present world-struggle has come into clear sight. It is very important to realize that ideas lie back of the actions which are disturbing men to-day. The type of political theory which men believe in determines what the world shall be. The problem of the war at present can be reduced to these simple terms: - which state shall win, the state of free democracy or the state of autocratic monarchy. It is our duty to understand the type of absolute state against which we are fighting, and to strengthen our conviction of the justice of

the type of free state for which we are fighting. The world has been thrown into turmoil because of the absolute conception of the state, and the world must finally be delivered by the ideal of the free state taking its place on a common basis among the parliament of states. In the latter ideal alone lies the promise of permanent peace for the world.

Let us clearly understand the absolute state which we are opposing, and let us endeavor to portray its theory and the development of its theory. We shall then realize that the results of the war as conducted by the absolute state are really the terrors of the theory. What has been done and is being done to shock humanity is no accident, but it is the outcome of the power of the absolute state. When we begin definitely to know the theory that menaces the whole world, we can more strongly unite our forces and more joyfully uphold our standards. It is necessary to travel backward some distance to the

beginnings of the nineteenth century in order to understand how the present theories of a Treitschke, a Bernhardi, a Lasson, a Naumann, a Tannenberg, and the whole group of German political thinkers and publicists have arisen. Among them all there is such a unity of ideals of the state and such a conformity of political belief and outlook that we can only explain it as shaped by consistent influences and ideas of the past. The unity and consistency of political belief has created the kind of diplomacy and warfare which has shocked us so strongly.

The present German political thinking of the modern type takes its beginning in German development like all great problems with the sage of Koenigsberg. The thoughtful and critical philosopher, Kant, had been deeply moved by our own war of independence. On the other hand the development of the French Revolution, whose ideals of right he had favored and whose conceptions of the just demands of

the people had taken hold of him, drove him into a reactionary position. In addition his own timidity and his own experience of the power of the Prussian state influenced him to turn aside from conceiving of the state internally in a republican form. Altho he advocated an eternal peace for the different states of the world, and really outlined the plan for a general court of arbitration and a common league of nations, nevertheless his devotion to monarchy in the life of the individual state made of no effect his dream of a world peace. Never, said Kant, should a people overthrow a monarchy, even under almost intolerable abuses of monarchical power. He held that a people should simply suffer the injustice of a ruler. To oppose a ruler means that a people takes unto itself political power. Such an action in the judgment of Kant destroys order and brings about anarchy. In contrast with anarchy every existing form of the state even tho it be founded upon mere power is

just because it is orderly. An effort to overthrow the reigning powers thru rebellion or an endeavor to remove them is morally wrong. Assassination of a monarch is parricide. Such an action is absolutely subversive of justice. With all his critical freedom, Kant nevertheless bows to the rising power of the Prussian state and endeavors to establish by reason the duty of unquestioning obedience to every action of the state. The seeming dawn of republican ideas in his mind never led to daylight. It was darkened by devotion to the monarchical ideal in its strongest form.

But it is in Kant's successor, Fichte, that we discover the origin of the preachments and of the philosophy which makes excessive claims for German culture as essential to the world. Fichte, who rests everything on the freedom of the ego, conceives of the state as the co-existence of reasonable beings who mutually recognize each other as free beings and are

willing to limit their freedom that there may be a common right. But this common right when it is established must be a common will. It is the first task of the state to find a will which is altogether a common will and with which the private will of men is united. In this state Fichte desires the inner development of industry and commerce to take place. He wants the state industrially closed as conditioned by its own natural boundaries. There is no conception of a necessary world-relationship. Fichte's state is Spartan in its emphasis on will. For him the only interests that can unite men are those of science. In all other efforts nations must reserve their own strength in their own life. With this theory Fichte combines an intense nationalism and an extravagant patriotism. He is at one with the German poets Arndt and Koerner and Geibel, who has coined the phrase, "Es muss durch deutsches Wesen, noch einmal die Welt genesen." The world is to be cured thru

Germany. With the great idealistic outburst at the beginning of the nineteenth century and the just desire of Germany for its national freedom, there is combined the tremendous claim that Germany's ideal must become the ideal of the world. In its freedom it believes itself capable and competent to become the leader of mankind. This overweening pride which seems to disregard or undervalue the cultural mission of other nations, and which claims as Teutonic everything that is excellent in the life of other people, found its first expression in Fichte's great Addresses to the German Nation. He believes that spiritual renewal can come only from the Germans. Toward the end of the last address he says, "The old world with its glory and greatness and with its defects has gone under; thru its own unworthiness and thru the power of your forefathers. If that which has been discussed in these addresses is truth, then you are the nation among all modern nations, in which

the germ of human perfectibility is most definitely found, and upon which progress in the development toward perfection has been placed as a task. If you in your inner reality succumb, then the hope of the whole human race to be delivered out of the depths of its evil must succumb." "There is no escape; if you go under, all mankind sinks with you without the hope of any possible restoration." * This ideal of Fichte of the absolute necessity of Germany and Germany's culture for the world has taken hold increasingly upon German thinking. A part of the pan-German movement has been the effort to translate into actuality the belief that Germany is the cultural saviour of the world. An overpowering pride has possessed the minds of modern German thinkers as representatives of a great national claim and mission. No matter how humble

* Kuno Fischer, Geschicte der neuern Philosophie, vol.6, p. 649; Fichte's Reden an die deutsche Nation, xiv, p. 481 ff.

scholars might be as individuals there was back of their thought this national prejudice of the superiority of German culture and its call to be the apostle of deliverance and salvation for all mankind. The fact that this culture must be carried forward thru a nation and that this nation must express itself thru a strong will is an essential German conviction.

But the final influence was not the cultural ideal of Fichte, but the conceptions which the last thinker of the idealistic school, Hegel, advocated. All his thinking endeavored to prove the essential movement of absolute reason. Because of this he despised the revolutionary efforts of his age. Thru the stages of position, negation and combination, his bloodless reason led him to see in the state the embodiment of the final and absolute spirit. The spirit as it became an object in the world was embodied in ethical life and this found its full expression in the state. From this point of view he glori-

fied Frederick II of Prussia as the monarch who conceived the universal purpose of the state, and who was the first among rulers to maintain this universality and to allow no place for that which was individual if it opposed the purpose of the state. The state is not to serve but to rule; it is not a means but an end, and the highest of all ends and purposes. Because the state rules and has itself as an end it is will, and all other purposes of human life must be subject to the state because it is the universal will. Within it all special and separate interests are combined and organized. It is the moral organism. And because its purposes are reason and will, therefore the state is spirit, and truly objective spirit. Every individual must seek his purpose and his ideals in the universal will of the state. There can be no attainment of any particular purpose or any individual welfare except in and thru the state. There is nothing higher in this world than the state, and its absolute

sovereignty is represented in the person of a monarch. For the maintenance of the state as the essential moral organism war is necessary. The existence and the non-existence of the state is involved in war. Wars may be terrible, but they are necessary for moral reasons, because they protect the state against inner decay and cowardice. We must experience the loss of all earthly goods and this experience leading even to the loss of life is only possible thru war. In the movements of war Hegel saw the soul of the world riding majestically thru the world. The state and its government is, therefore, the incarnation of absolute reason and absolute justice as expressed in absolute will. This ideal of the state is not the aristocratic dream of a Plato, who still thinks of a republic. It is not the city of God of Augustine, who conceives of the Church as an institution that brings God's rule thru Christ into the world. The state of Hegel is absolute logic far beyond the idea of

any personal God. It is a pantheistic glorification of the state which Prussia translated into actuality. Hegel's government is founded "by the sublime force of great men, not by physical strength. The great man has something in his features so that others gladly call him lord. They obey him against their will. Their immediate will is his will, but their conscious will is otherwise. . . . This is the prerogative of the great man to ascertain and to express the absolute will. All gather around his banner. He is their God." "The State is the self-certain absolute mind which recognizes no definite authority but its own; which acknowledges no abstract rules of good and bad, shameful and mean, craft and deception." "It is absolutely only universality as against particularism. As this absolute, ideal, universal, compared to which everything else is particular, it is the phenomenon of God. Its words are his decision, and it can appear and exist under no other form. . . The absolute

government is divine, self-sanctioned and not made." * Thus we find in Hegel the complete basis for the right of the state expressing itself in will, the state as above all morality, as God Himself, and as the complete organic whole of morality. Hegel became the father of the whole Prussian conception of the state, its superidealizing of the state, and its justification of war. Every extravagant utterance translated into actual practice by modern political thinkers of Germany is the outcome of the glorification of the state which Hegel created.

The great philosopher of pessimism, Schopenhauer, reverts to Kant's practical philosophy of will and to Fichte's emphasis of the will in the ego, while he unconsciously also carries forward Hegel's accentuation of will. He stands for the

* For this whole view of Hegel, see Kuno Fischer, Geschichte der neuern Philosophie, v. viii, pp. 726, 738, 807. Hegel, System der Sittlichkeit, p. 32 ff. Wallace, Hegel's Philosophy of Mind, p. clxxxii.

claim of egoism, as the affirmation of the will to live. It is this affirmation that makes right or wrong. Wrong must be opposed by the negation of the will that opposes, and must be met thru the external power of forcible self-protection. Where this power does not avail, the secret influence of the lie of necessity must be exerted. Since all men have the will to live, we need an institution which protects them against interference with their right to live. The institution which guards this right thru power is the state. Nothing injures the state as much as anarchy, which is a return to primitive conditions. In its best form the state becomes a constitutional monarchy. Thus even this great thinker who elsewhere desires to be delivered from evil thru sympathy is the exponent of will and finds the protection of the will to live only in the universal will of the state.

The great disciple of the philosopher of the will to live is the preacher of the

will to power, the creator of the blonde beast, the erratic but influential Nietzsche. He says, "There is nothing in life that has value except the degree of power -- assuming that life itself is this will to power."* The new gospel of this preacher of power is "Be hard." It is opposed to the old value of a man as a man. Man is only the ladder to the superman. His importance is his power. For this reason the Christian morality which protects the weak must be destroyed, because the weak are the bad. The strong are those that are right and are just. We need morality for lords and not for slaves. The old God of mercy is dead. The new God is power, and power makes the strong cause the good cause. Thus the good cause hallows war, and it is the good war which hallows every cause. War and courage have done more and truer and better things than charity. These and similar

* Nietzsche, Der Wille zur Macht, Taschen-Ausgabe, Vol. 9, p. 15.

ideas sound like the fulminations of a mad philosopher, and madness was the end of the life of the brilliant Nietzsche. But unfortunately the madness of Nietzsche enthused young Germany and became the conviction of a growing generation. And the state understood how to turn this materialistic aberration into the channel of service for its own advantage. The heathenish ideals of Nietzsche were adopted, and during this war their practice confirms the fact that they were believed in.

The modern Germany has found its clearest expositor of the ideals of the German state in the lectures on politics by Treitschke, which were permitted and endorsed as the Prussian and German conception. According to this approved professor at the University of Berlin, the mouthpiece in 1890 and the following years of the empire of William I, and of Bismarck, the state is not the work of sinful man, but "the objectively revealed

Will of God"[a] as unfolded in its life. The state is a real personality "in a juridical and in a politico-moral sense."[b] The center of this personality is will. "The state must have the most emphatic will that can be imagined."[c] It is the great collective personality and must assert itself. It is "power, precisely in order to assert itself as against other equally independent powers. War and the administration of justice are the tasks of even the most barbaric states."[d] The strong will of different nations is bound to come into conflict, but "the grandeur of history lies in the perpetual conflict of nations, and it is simply foolish to desire the suppression of their rivalry. Mankind has ever found it to be so."[e] The glory of all history is founded on the story of the nations, of which every one has its will of power and is absolute-

[a] H. von Treitschke, Politics, Vol. I, p. 13.
[b] Ibid. Vol. I, p. 15.
[c] Ibid. Vol. I, p. 16.
[d] Ibid. Vol. I, p. 19.
[e] Ibid. Vol. I, p. 21.

ly sovereign. "No limit can be set to the functions of the state."[f] It must dominate the outer life of its members, and must find that its duty is to go far beyond the minimum that assures its very existence. "We then see at once that its first duty is the double one of maintaining power without and law within, and its primary obligations must be the care of its Army and its Jurisprudence."[g] Since the army is essential to the life of the state and belongs to its very nature, the state must maintain itself in full power and strength, and therefore war is necessary to its existence. "Without war no state could be. All those we know of arose thru war, and the protection of their members by armed force remains their primary and essential task. War, therefore will endure to the end of history, as long as there is a multiplicity of states. The laws of human thought and of human nature for-

[f] Ibid. Vol. I, p. 63.
[g] Ibid. Vol. I, p. 63.

bid any alternative; neither is one to be wished for. The blind worshipper of an eternal peace falls into the error of isolating the state, or dreams of one which is universal, which we have already seen to be at variance with reason."[h] When a state declares war, it is performing an inevitable duty, and because this ideal of force is essential, no international law and no arbitration must take away the right of the state and the right of war, for "war is both justifiable and moral, and the ideal of perpetual peace is not only impossible, but immoral as well."[i] "The state is no violet to bloom unseen; its power should stand forth proudly for all the world to see, and it cannot allow even the symbols of it to be contested."[j] All restraints to which the state, therefore, binds itself are purely voluntary, and consequently, "all treaties are concluded on the tacit under-

h Ibid. Vol. I, p. 65.
i Ibid. Vol. II, p. 599.
j Ibid. Vol. II, p. 595.

standing *rebus sic stantibus.*"[k] The state has power at any time to abrogate its treaties. To maintain such a state monarchy is an essential, and to maintain monarchy it is necessary to assert its divine right which means "that the inscrutable will of Providence has decreed the elevation of a particular family above its rivals."[l] Any one who is called providentially as a member of a select family to rule must have high qualifications. Among these "piety is a fundamental requirement in a monarch, since the notion that he stands immeasurably above all other men may actually unsettle his reason, if it be not balanced by personal humility which compels him to acknowledge himself God's instrument. All this does not abrogate the axiom that it is the nature and aim of monarchy to be of this world. Genuine monarchy does not

[k] Ibid., Vol. II p. 596.

[l] Ibid. Vol. II, p. 59.

aspire to partnership with the Almighty."[m] Unfortunately this fundamental requirement of a monarchy is exceedingly hard to observe, and therefore, the very fear of Treitschke has been realized thru William II, who has claimed partnership with the Almighty, for he said in a speech of March 28, 1901, "We shall conquer everywhere, even though we be surrounded by enemies on all sides; for there lives a powerful ally, the old good God in heaven, who . . . has always been on our side." The theory of Treitschke is the clear exposition of all that the Prussian state is and all that the German Empire stands for, and it has been endorsed by the actions and deeds of the German Empire.

Another theorist who has seconded Treitschke in every way is Lasson. In his conception of the ideal of culture and the war he said "separate states are therefore by nature in a state of war with each other. Conflict must be regarded as the

[m] Ibid. Vol. II, p. 59.

essence of their relations and as the rule, friendship as accidental and exceptional." "In the intercourse of State with State there are no laws, and there can be none." "Everything in the State must be calculated for the possibility of war." "In politics decisions may be postponed, but when the opportunity presents itself, let him who has the power and feels himself prepared cut the knot with the sword. For great historical questions this is the only rational and permanent solution."[n]

The fullest development of the necessity of war as the expression of the life of the state has been given by Bernhardi. He says, "All petty and personal interests force their way to the front during a long period of peace. Selfishness and intrigue run riot, and luxury obliterates idealism."[t] He believes that only for the sake of money-making do we Americans endeavor to

[n] Out of their own Mouths, Appleton & Co. 1917, p. 35 ff.

[t] Germany and the Next War, Bernhardi, p. 26.

escape war. War, he believes, is essentially approved by Christianity. He says, "Christian morality is based, indeed on the law of love. 'Love God above all things, and thy neighbor as thyself.' This law can claim no significance for the relations of one country to another, since its application to politics would lead to a conflict of duties. The love which a man showed to another country as such would imply a want of love for his own countrymen. Such a system of politics must inevitably lead men astray. Christian morality is personal and social, and in its nature cannot be political. Its object is to promote morality of the individual, in order to strengthen him to work unselfishly in the interests of the community. It tells us to love our individual enemies, but does not remove the conception of enmity. Christ Himself said: 'I am not come to send peace on earth, but a sword.' His teaching can never be adduced as an argument against the universal law of struggle. There nev-

er was a religion which was more combative than Christianity. Combat, moral combat, is its very essence. If we transfer the ideas of Christianity to the sphere of politics, we can claim to raise the power of the State – power in the widest sense, not merely from the material aspect – to the highest degree, with the object of the moral advancement of humanity, and under certain conditions the sacrifice may be made which a war demands. Thus, according to Christianity we cannot disapprove of war in itself, but must admit that it is justified morally and historically."[u] The necessity of war is found in the necessity of fundamental competition among men. "With the cessation of the unrestricted competition, whose ultimate appeal is to arms, all real progress would soon be checked, and a moral and intellectual stagnation would ensue which must end in degeneration."[v] Therefore,

[u] Ibid. p. 29.

[v] Ibid. p. 29.

men must absolutely oppose all ideas that peace is a finality. "Every means must therefore be employed to oppose these visionary schemes. They must be publicly denounced as what they really are—as an unhealthy and feeble Utopia, or a cloak for political machinations. Our people must learn to see that *the maintenance of peace never can or may be the goal of a policy.*" *

These publicists who are incessantly reiterating the claim of war are further encouraged by the great economists. During the very period of the war the economic dreams of Germany have been most fully expressed and most ably argued by Naumann in his great book on Central Europe. He too does not suppose that at the conclusion of the war "the long jubilee years of an everlasting peace will begin."[w] Most fully he elaborates the necessity of a thoro systematization of

* Ibid. p. 37.

[w] Naumann, Central Europe, p. 7.

the nation in every economic detail. The advocate of a state socialism, he would unite Germany and Austria as the first step toward a great world power which has adequate economic resources. Altho Naumann is a socialist, he does not dream of peace. His outlook is not the large one of peaceful economic inter-relations in the world. For him the economic claims of Germany and the demands of a greater empire mean continuous economic conquest. He sees growing up a nationalized socialism, and a systematized national economy. When he has expressed this hope, he breaks out into this eloquent appeal: "Fichte and Hegel nod approval from the walls: now, after the war, the German is at last becoming heart and soul a political economic citizen. His ideal is and will be the organism and not free will, reason and not the blind struggle for existence. This constitutes our freedom, our self-development. By its means we shall enjoy our golden age as other con-

quering nations in other ages and with other abilities and excellences have done before us. Our epoch dawns when English capitalism has reached and overstepped its highest point, and we have been educated for this epoch by Frederick II, Kant, Scharnhorst, Siemens, Krupp, Bismarck, Bebel, Legien, Kirdorf, and Ballin. Our dead have fallen on the field for the sake of this our Fatherland. Germany, foremost in the world!" [x]

Is there any further need of continuing to describe the German theory? Have we not sufficiently demonstrated how it has developed and how the great conceptions of the state as will have been turned into the conceptions of the state as absolute power? Have we not seen how the state has been placed above all morality and made an arbitrary God of might? Everything has been put into subservience to the state and "Kultur" has been used

x Ibid. p. 123.

as a means not of benefiting mankind but of advancing the claims and the demands of the German Empire. Truly its ideals are impossible in a modern world, for they are a constant menace to progress and peace. Germany, having made effective her theory of the state thru great commercial and industrial efficiency, will remain a menace as long as she believes and practices what she believes in reference to the state. Our task is a great one. It implies not only a victory, but a conversion of the thot of a whole people to an ideal of the state entirely different from its own. As long as those conceptions of the state live, which Germany now holds, so long will the world be unsafe for mankind.

Over against this menacing ideal it is the supreme duty of America to reassert her conception of the state. In her ideals the state is fundamentally the institute of justice, and society organized for the sake of right. It is true that soci-

ety organized to maintain its common life and order needs the assertion of authority, and authority does exercise power. But the state is not founded primarily for the sake of power, but for the sake of the social welfare and the political well-being of men. The state is naught else but society organized for the purpose of the maintenance of justice. Its right is derived from those who constitute it, and it cannot be an end in itself, and an idealized abstraction of power superimposed upon men who have a right to political freedom, and whose government must be carried on with their consent. Our ideal of the state is that of society maintaining itself and bringing blessing to all within thru the life of the state. The state is for the benefit of those governed, and does not find its center in the authority of those who govern. The state is but one among many which desire to live with each other in bonds of universal peace. No state has a power and a sovereignty

that disregards the power and sovereignty of another state. It lives its own life but it also lives a common life, and is ready to fight not for selfish considerations but for the deliverance of the oppressed. The state as we conceive it is the protector of the weak, and destroys the strong that hamper happiness on earth. It would unite with other states in governing the world by justice, and disbelieves that war is the proper method of adjusting the great questions of righteousness in the world.

These ideals of ours lie at the very foundation of our national existence. They were most clearly and definitely expressed when we adopted our constitution, by such a thinker as Alexander Hamilton, who was an inheritor of the political liberalism of John Locke. In the great Federalist papers it is fundamentally affirmed that our government is strictly republican, because "it is evident that no other form would be reconcilable

with the genius of the People of America." And a republic is "a government which derives all its powers directly or indirectly from the great body of the People and is administered by persons holding their offices during pleasure, for a limited period, or during good behavior. It is *essential* to such a Government, that it be derived from the great body of the society, not from an inconsiderable proportion, or a favored class of it; otherwise a handful of tyrannical nobles, exercising their oppressions by a delegation of their powers, might aspire to the rank of republicans, and claim for their Government the honorable title of republic. It is *sufficient* for such a Government, that the persons administering it be appointed, either directly or indirectly, by the People; and that they hold their appointments by either of the tenures just specified; otherwise every Government in the United States, as well as every other popular Government that has been or can be well organ-

ized or well executed, would be degraded from the republican character."* Such an ideal lies at the foundation of our government and shapes all our actions. And because we have this belief in the relation of the great body of the people to government, we must fundamentally be opposed to war except when it is forced upon us. A democracy is generally the greatest safeguard against war and when it enters into it, it seeks not its own. In Europe, and especially in Germany, the advance of democracy has been hindered. Mr. Croly well says: "As a consequence of their development as nations, the European peoples have been unable to get along without a certain infusion of democracy; but it was for the most part essential to their national interest that such an infusion should be strictly limited."[y] This infusion has grown in other European nations than the German. The

* The Federalist, No. 38.

y Croly, The Promise of American Life, p. 265.

present menace is the effort of Germany to overthrow the democratic ideal in the world. Its conditions are truly that of a nation which is moved by the love of power and the desire for pre-eminence and dominion. Consequently it must oppose and will oppose every paper of state which President Wilson sends forth. He has become the mouthpiece of our country and the hope of democracy. In his conception "Government is merely the executive organ of society, the organ through which its habit acts, through which its will becomes operative, through which it adapts itself to its environment and works out for itself a more effective life."[o] The need of the state is the need of the life of society. And as society exists of all classes of men. In its very being it must be essentially democratic, whatever may be its form. Our present task is to defend the ideal of the state, of the democratic state, but not in the terms of

[o]Wilson, The State, p. 576.

the idealism of the eighteenth century. Our problem is to maintain the free state with its large political rights for both men and women, with its great moral tasks, in a new age. The old American ideas of our republic need an adaptation to an age of large social relationship, and of great international connections. We have inherent in our life and in our political traditions that conception of the state which the world needs, but we must be able to make it clear to men what are the essentials and what the accidentals of our faith. It is necessary for us to distinguish clearly between our true ideals and the misdevelopments and dangers that threaten us. We need to be aroused to a clearer political consciousness and to a definite grasp of what nationality and the state mean in terms of world interest. There are, it seems to me, three great dangers in our own development which we must meet. There exist three great problems which we must work out.

The first problem is that of maintaining our ancient inheritance of freedom in an increasingly social and economic age. There is no doubt in the mind of anyone who has observed and studied the trend of affairs, that it will be increasingly necessary for the state to control great economic interests. Trade, commerce and industry cannot remain merely individual affairs. We are tied up with all the world, and therefore, these relationships must be expressed in terms of the state. So vast have become the connections of great business that to allow it to go uncontrolled will mean continuous industrial warfare. So strong are the organizations of labor that to permit them to make their own solutions apart from the interests of the whole state is impossible. Our task is to regulate without suppression, and to control without destroying. We will not be able to maintain political liberty without economic control, but if we proceed to an excessive systematic management of bus-

iness hitherto private, we shall drift by practice into an idea of the state which contradicts the conception of the republic that our fathers had. It is imperative that we should find the balance between necessary direction of great business and labor, of trade, industry and commerce, and the freedom and initiative which ought not to be taken away from individual ability and from the personal and corporate rights of groups of individuals. We must be careful indeed not to perpetuate what the exigencies of the war have forced upon us in the control and management of business. It is our duty to preach against the selfishness, the greed, the arbitrariness of those who are forcing us constantly to control what ought to be uncontrolled. In order to escape that dominating socilization, which will impair our freedom, we mnst advocate a great and just social morality that enters into every avenue of business.

Our second problem is to become ef-

ficient and still remain democratic. Apparently the increase of efficiency implies the increase of machinery. The growth of machinery makes individual men mere cogs in a great structure. The most efficient nation today is Germany, and its efficiency is the outgrowth of its high centralization and its autocratic government. If efficiency cannot be made democratic, it were better that we should continue bungling and be free, than to be efficient and lose our freedom. Efficiency must become a matter of education. It is our task to lead the people step by step into the realization that the modern world demands in the life of the state that we shall cooperate far more largely than ever before. The method of imposing efficiency upon a people is a quicker way of gaining the end, but it is not the fairer and juster way. National efficiency is liable to be interpreted in terms of a military establishment. We do not doubt that our nation will permanently need a larger army and

navy, unless we succeed in obtaining actual disarmament. we cannot live in peace because of our evil neighbor across the ocean; but the question is shall his enmity compel us to endanger democracy thru efficiency. It is a very serious question, whether it is possible to have a minutely organized and thoroly efficient government and a people similarly organized without detriment to that ideal of freedom for which America stands. Far be it from me to decry just efficiency, but let us not be overpowered by this conception to the exclusion of liberty and independence.

The third danger is the loss, in this socialized age of efficiency, of the right of personality. It is true that we cannot suffer arbitrary individualism. It is necessary for all of us to impose greater limitation upon our freedom, but nevertheless this is the question, whether we shall be hampered in the inherent rights of the free search after truth and the free decision about the truth in every sphere. The

increasing socilization is liable to hamper public opinion. Public opinion is liable to be deprived of that variety of ideas which keep it from stagnating. But the death of public opinion is the death of democracy. Personality is that which from time to time stirs up public opinion and brings it to itself and purifies its turbid waters. We need personality to maintain our moral self-rest. It is an exceedingly bad thing that we must be controlled by laws and threats of punishment to keep us from doing the wrong. Our appeal in great public and economic questions must be to the personal conscience. Some of the evils from which we are suffering are due to the fact that the conscience of individuals and of corporations has been lax. To awaken personality means to awaken the conscience and will aid us in solving great problems without increasing legislation. We must maintain the right of personality for the sake of religious freedom. The danger in a highly socialized

society is the danger of interfering with the rights and prerogatives of the human conscience in spiritual matters. At some point or other individual religious convictions will be touched and hampered by a control strongly centralized and thoroly organized. The danger does not seem imminent, but it is nevertheless present. It belongs to the right of personality to sanctify patriotism by religion, but it does not belong to the rights of patriotism to make demands upon religion which are not within the very motives of that religion. The church dare not rule the state, but the state dare not dictate to the church. It is necessary that we should think clearly and definitely upon this great question of personality as it touches our highest interests. But with these reservations clearly understood and with the high hope that we shall meet the demands of our age without losing our democracy and being impaired in the rights of our personality, we shall accept

the challenge of the present. Let us conclude as we began by making our own the prayer of Longfellow for the Ship of State, when he sings:

"Our hearts, our hopes, are all with thee,
Our hearts, our hopes, our prayers, our tears,
Our faith triumphant o'er our fears,
Are all with thee,—are all with thee."